

October 23, 2012

comments@eisgatewaypacificwa.gov

To Whom It May Concern:

I am a homeowner in Bellingham, Washington and I operate three businesses here: Beason Editorial Services, Sirius Investigations, and Pamela Beason, Author. These businesses could be operated from anywhere with internet connections, but I chose to locate here because of the unique physical beauty and recreational opportunities found in Whatcom County and adjacent areas. I am a hiker, a kayaker, and a scuba diver. Many of my books deal with ecological and conservation topics. And like most Bellingham residents, I spend a lot of time in all our waterfront parks, including Boulevard Park, Marine Park, Larrabee State Park, Chuckanut Bay Shorelands, Maritime Heritage, and Zuanich Parks. As you know, all these parks are adjacent to railroad tracks that would carry all the increased traffic from the proposed Gateway Coal Terminal.

I urge you to include in the EIS a study of all impacts on air quality and water quality from shipping to and from the proposed Gateway terminal. This study should include a nonbiased examination of negative impacts caused by:

- Air pollution that will be generated by increased railway traffic—not only coal dust escaping into the air from loaded cars but air pollution also generated by train locomotives
- Air pollution generated by escaping coal dust and other exhaust from machinery that will be involved in the loading and unloading processes
- Air pollution generated by increased ship traffic coming and going from the proposed terminal
- Water pollution generated by increased runoff into water sources adjacent to the railway, both saltwater bays and shorelines and freshwater creeks over which the railway passes
- Water pollution caused by the increased ship traffic coming and going from the proposed terminal
- Potential harm caused to fish populations by water pollution in both salt and fresh water
- Potential damage to commercial fishing opportunities due to reduction in fish population caused by water pollution from increased rail and ship traffic

I believe that approving the proposed Gateway terminal would violate the following U.S. Acts:

- Marine Mammal Protection Act – Orcas and other endangered marine mammals in our area will be threatened by noise, water pollution, and loss of their food supply.
- Coastal Zone Management Act – As the railway line to the proposed terminal is located along many miles of coastline, approval of the proposed terminal would endanger all these areas.
- Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act – Because the railway line to the proposed terminal passes over and through saltwater bays, freshwater estuaries, and freshwater creeks, there is great potential to harm fish spawning grounds.
- Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act - Because the railway line to the proposed terminal passes over and through saltwater bays, freshwater estuaries, and freshwater creeks, there is great potential to harm fish spawning grounds, and increased marine traffic to and from the proposed terminal will impact commercial and recreational fishing areas, which are of great economic importance to our region.
- Oceans Act – Increased runoff, air pollution, and increased shipping traffic will negatively impact our oceans.
- Clean Air Act – Increased air pollution from train locomotives, coal dust from traveling rail cars and from loading/unloading processes, air pollution generated by increased ship traffic, and additional air pollution from China fueled by this terminal's exports will all conflict with the Clean Air Act.

In addition, the detrimental effects of increased burning of coal in China should be considered in the EIS, because air quality in Asia eventually affects the United States. The EIS should include a nonbiased study of:

- Air pollution generated by burning coal in China that is projected to affect our air quality and weather in the United States
- Global warming caused by burning of additional coal in China

Alternatives

If a terminal is to be built, there are many better places to build one than along a shoreline reached only by railways that disrupt traffic in hundreds of cities and impact many miles of pristine coastline. Whatcom County and adjacent Island, San Juan, and Skagit Counties are known for outdoor tourism, an industry that is likely to be severely damaged by the impacts of this proposed port.

Why not locate a terminal in an area that is already a large industrial port with shipping traffic and railway line that would not transport coal along miles of coastline? Everett, Washington would be a much better and more logical location for such a facility than rural Whatcom County.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Pamela S. Beason". The signature is written in a cursive style with a long, sweeping underline.

Pamela S. Beason
3301 Brandywine Ct
Bellingham, WA 98226